

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include changes to Figures 1, 2 and 4. The attached "Replacement Sheets," which include Figures 1-4, replace the original sheets including Figures 1-4.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 9 and 11 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-11 stand rejected. Claim 10 has been cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has attached formal drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheets" for Figures 1-4, reference numbers 28 and 14 in Figures 1 and 2 have been clarified and reference number 10 has been added to Figure 4.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2, 4 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claims 2, 4 and 7 to overcome these informalities. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Linksys WAP11 Instant Wireless Network Access Point – PracticallyNetworked.com* (by Tim Higgins, "<http://practicallynetworked.com/review.asp?pid=400>", relevant update: 9/1/2001, hereinafter "Higgins") in view of Tjalldin et al. (U.S. Pat. App. Publication No. 2004/0014497, hereinafter "Tjalldin"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicant notes claim 1 calls for “a first connector interface cable comprising a connector for connecting the apparatus to a networking interface circuit of the computing device...a conversion module for receiving a first networking signal from the connector interface cable and converting the first networking signal into a second networking signal [and] a wireless networking interface card disposed in said conversion module and in communication with said conversion module for interfacing the second networking signal with said wireless network, to thereby interface said computing device to said wireless network.” Claim 11 calls for “using a cable to interface said independent apparatus to said network port of said computing device [and] using a network card disposed in the independent apparatus and operably associated with said independent apparatus for receiving said signals in said second format and transmitting said signals to said wireless network.” Applicant respectfully asserts that at least these features as claimed are not taught nor suggested by either Higgins nor Tjalldin either alone or in combination.

Higgins appears merely to disclose a wireless networking hub operable to generate a wireless networking signal for a home network (see at least page 1). Higgins does not mention whatsoever the use of a cable coupled to a conversion module to interface a personal computing device with a wireless networking card to connect the personal computing device to the wireless network through the wireless networking card. Applicant respectfully submits the Examiner has incorrectly analyzed Higgins as the use of the Ethernet cable in Higgins is to enable the user to connect a primary computing device to the wireless hub to create a network, but does not enable the primary computing device to connect to the wireless hub through a wireless networking card. Applicant further notes that Tjalldin does not remedy the shortcomings of Higgins.

Tjalldin appears merely to disclose a bridge for communicating between two wireless networks (see at least [0014]). Tjalldin does not disclose whatsoever interfacing the wireless networks to a personal computing device and further does not mention whatsoever the use of an interface cable to communicate with a conversion module to interface the computing device with a wireless network through a wireless network card as presently claimed. Accordingly, as neither Higgins nor Tjalldin, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the invention as called for in claims 1 and 11, Applicant respectfully asserts claims 1 and 11 are patentable for at least these reasons. In addition, as claim 5 depends from claim 1, claim 5 is also believed to be in condition for allowance for at least these reasons. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 7 stands rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higgins. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 has been amended to call for “connecting the network interface of the computing device to a wireless connectivity device, and using the wireless connectivity device to interface the portable computing device to the wireless network through a wireless networking card supported by the wireless connectivity device.” As discussed previously, Higgins does not mention whatsoever the use of a wireless networking card to connect the personal computing device to the wireless network through a wireless networking card. Hence, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts claim 7 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 8 and 9 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higgins in view of Bork et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,333,932, hereinafter “Bork”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant notes claims 8 and 9 each depend from claim 7. As stated previously, Applicant believes claim 7 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant also believes claims 8 and 9 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 4, 2005

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686
Erica K. Schaefer, Reg. No. 55,861

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600
MDE/EKS/ps